



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/621,952	07/17/2003	Timur Tabi	AUS920030472US1(4011)	1545
45557	7590	06/22/2007	EXAMINER	
IBM CORPORATION (JSS)			GEE, JASON KAI YIN	
C/O SCHUBERT OSTERRIEDER & NICKELSON PLLC			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
6013 CANNON MOUNTAIN DRIVE, S14			2134	
AUSTIN, TX 78749			MAIL DATE	
			06/22/2007	
			DELIVERY MODE	
			PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/621,952	TABI, TIMUR
Examiner	Art Unit	
Jason K. Gee	2134	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 July 2003.
2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is response to communication: filed on 07/17/2003.
2. Claims 1-22 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1, 9, and 17 are independent claims.
3. No IDS was received for this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
5. Claims 1, 2, 5, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 19, 21, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chiang US Patent Application Publication 2001/0047477 (hereinafter '477), and in view of Simon St. Laurent's Cookies, 1998, (hereinafter Laurent).

As per claim 1, Chiang teaches a method for logging a successful authentication of a user, the method comprising: generating a session identification in response to the authentication to identify a login session for the user (paragraphs 54 and 56); storing the session identification in a memory location to authenticate the user for at least one of the independent applications (paragraph 51, 52, 54, and 56); transmitting the session identification to the user (paragraph 56); and authenticating the user for the at least one

of the independent applications in response to receipt of the session identification upon verifying the session identification is stored in the memory location (paragraph 52 and 55).

However, at the time of the invention, Chiang does not explicitly teach wherein the memory location is configured to retain the session identification independent of de-allocations of memory for individual applications. However, this is well known in the art, if not an inherent property of cookies. This is taught by Laurent on page 22, where it recites "Much like real cookies, browser cookies don't last forever. Some cookies disappear when the user quits the browser, while others can hang around for months or years." As can be seen, cookies may be dependent solely on the expiration date, and is therefore independent of de-allocations of memory for individual applications.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Chiang with the teachings of Laurent. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such an addition to be able to continually use the information provided by the cookie. As already seen in both references, cookies are created initially so they can be used for authentication in subsequent requests in the future. This is mentioned by Laurent on page 2, where it recites "Cookies are one key answer to this problem, allowing developers to keep information stowed away between Web page retrievals and create transactions with context."

As per claim 2, Chiang teaches further comprising storing additional session information with the session identification to associate the additional session information with the login session (paragraph 52, 55, Figure 3).

As per claim 5, Chiang teaches generating a session identification comprises generating a random number, the random number uniquely identifying the user's login session (paragraph 54)

As per claim 7, Chiang teaches generating a cookie and transmitting the cookie to a web browser utilized by the user (paragraphs 54-56).

As per claim 8, Chiang teaches throughout the reference wherein authenticating the user comprises receiving the session identification from the user and comparing the session identification with session identifications previously stored in the memory location (paragraph 56, and inherent to the teachings of Chiang, as the browser uses the cookie to authenticate itself in lieu of password; also, is shown in the code of Figure 6C and 6D).

Independent claim 9 is rejected using the same basis of arguments used to reject claim 1 above.

Claim 12 is rejected using the same basis of arguments used to reject claim 5 above.

Claim 13 is rejected using the same basis of arguments used to reject claim 2 above.

Claim 15 is rejected using the same basis of arguments used to reject claim 7 above.

Claim 16 is rejected using the same basis of arguments used to reject claim 8 above.

Independent claim 17 is rejected using the same basis of arguments used to reject claim 1 above.

As per claim 19, Laurent teaches on page 22 associating a time indication with the session identification to facilitate removal of the session identification from the memory location upon expiration of the login session.

Claim 21 is rejected using the same basis of arguments used to reject claim 5 above.

Claim 22 is rejected using the same basis of arguments used to reject claim 8 above.

6. Claims 3, 14, 18, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chiang US Patent Application Publication 2001/and Simon St. Laurent's *Cookies*, 1998, as applied above, and further in view of Colby US Patent No. 6,625,643 (hereinafter Colby).

As per claim 3, Laurent teaches on page 22 of associating a time indication with the session identification. However, Laurent does not explicitly teach removing the session identification from the memory location after a period of inactivity. This is taught by Colby though, in col. 27 lines 10-20, wherein cookies (which hold session identification information), are deleted after a certain time of inactivity.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Colby with the Chiang combination. One of ordinary skill in the art would be

motivated to perform such an addition to free up memory, allowing more importation information to be stored. Also, freeing up memory may cause other programs to work faster as well.

Claim 14 is rejected using the same basis of arguments used to reject claim 3 above.

Claim 18 is rejected using the same basis of arguments used to reject claim 3 above.

Claim 20 is rejected using the same basis of arguments used to reject claim 3 above.

7. Claims 4 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chiang US Patent Application Publication 2001/and Simon St. Laurent's Cookies, 1998, as applied above, and further in view of Wu US Patent Application Publication 2004/0068572 (hereinafter Wu).

As per claim 4, Chiang and Laurent do not explicitly teach locking the memory location while accessing an entry for the session identification in the memory location, but Wu teaches this in paragraphs 73 and 76.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Wu with Chiang and Laurent. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such an addition to prevent errors. Paragraph 73 of Wu teaches that locking memory prevents other programs from writing

to information when that information is being used. By doing so, session data will not be used incorrectly.

Claim 10 is rejected using the same basis of arguments used to reject claim 4, in which simultaneous access to the memory location by more than one of the individual applications is prevented by utilizing locks in memory.

8. Claims 6 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chiang US Patent Application Publication 2001/and Simon St. Laurent's *Cookies*, 1998, as applied above, and further in view of Walls US Patent Application Publication 2004/0156378 (hereinafter Walls).

As per claim 6, Chiang and Laurent do not explicitly teach storing the session identification in a shared memory buffer. However, storing session identifiers in a shared memory buffer is taught by Walls in paragraphs 5 and 42.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Chiang and Laurent with Walls. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such an addition to be able to transmit information at a higher efficiency. By storing session identifiers in a shared buffer, communications will go more smoothly and would be easier to manage. Walls is analogous art, as it deals with the use of session identifiers in communication and is directed toward smooth communication.

Claim 11 is rejected using the same basis of arguments used to reject claim 6 above.

Conclusion

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jason K. Gee whose telephone number is (571) 272-6431. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 7:00 am to 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kambiz Zand can be reached on (571) 272-3811. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jason Gee
Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2134
06/18/2007



KAMBIZ ZAND
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER